



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/841,232	04/23/2001	Christophe Gourraud	27950-432USPT	6390

27902 7590 07/14/2005
ERICSSON RESEARCH CANADA
8400 DECARIE BLVD.
MONTREAL, QC H4P 2N2
CANADA

EXAMINER

MANIWANG, JOSEPH R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2144

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/841,232

Applicant(s)

GOURRAUD, CHRISTOPHE

Examiner

Joseph R. Maniwang

Art Unit

2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 17-24 and 32-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 17-24 and 32-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. Claims 1-3, 6, 9-11, 14-17, 19-22, and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Deo et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,393,481), hereinafter referred to as Deo.
2. Regarding claims 1, 14, 17, and 32, Deo disclosed a method and system for providing real-time call processing services. Deo disclosed a call server or network entity for receiving call events (see column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 4; column 10, lines 21-45). In response to call events, the call server then sent triggers to a service manager, which in turn determined the proper applications to execute, and invoked the applications via an API (see column 6, lines 35-47, 58-67; column 18, lines 44-55; column 19, lines 11-33; column 21, line 17; column 35, lines 62-64). Deo further disclosed the use of predetermined criteria or user data for call processing, such information obtained from profiles on a networked storage device (see column 6, lines 11-15, 62-66; column 12, lines 58-62; column 18, lines 51-52).
3. Regarding claim 2, Deo disclosed the use of objects implemented by an application of a service, in which information regarding an object with which the application must interact as claimed in inherent (see column 13, lines 48-58).

Art Unit: 2144

4. Regarding claims 3, 6, 20, and 33, Deo disclosed the use of an application-programming interface (see column 21, lines 17-20; column 23, lines 7-10).
5. Regarding claims 9 and 21, Deo disclosed the use of a cache for storing call-related information (see column 28, lines 34-45; column 28, line 57 through column 29, line 11).
6. Regarding claims 10 and 19, Deo disclosed the service manager serving as a proxy (see column 13, lines 59-64; column 17, line 65 through column 18, line 2; column 18, lines 9-13).
7. Regarding claims 11, 22, and 34, Deo disclosed the invention in context of an intelligent network (see column 6, lines 1-4; column 8, line 10).
8. Regarding claim 15, Deo disclosed associating a caller to the call server through the use of identifiers (see column 24, lines 36-41).
9. Regarding claim 16, Deo disclosed that a first and second event received by a call server could be the same event (see column 17, lines 1-21).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. Claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 12, 13, 18, 23, 24, and 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Deo et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,393,481), hereinafter referred to as Deo, and further in view of Bos et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,456,857), hereinafter referred to as Bos.
11. Deo disclosed a method and system for providing real-time call processing services. Deo disclosed a call server or network entity for receiving call events (see

Art Unit: 2144

column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 4; column 10, lines 21-45). In response to call events, the call server then sent triggers to a service manager, which in turn determined the proper applications to execute, and invoked the applications via an API (see column 6, lines 35-47, 58-67; column 18, lines 44-55; column 19, lines 11-33; column 21, line 17; column 35, lines 62-64). Deo further disclosed the use of predetermined criteria or user data for call processing, such information obtained from profiles on a networked storage device (see column 6, lines 11-15, 62-66; column 12, lines 58-62; column 18, lines 51-52). Deo disclosed the use of objects implemented by an application of a service (see column 13, lines 48-58). Deo disclosed the use of an application-programming interface (see column 21, lines 17-20; column 23, lines 7-10). Deo also disclosed the invention in context of an intelligent network (see column 6, lines 1-4; column 8, line 10).

12. While Deo disclosed the use of an API, Deo did not specifically disclose the use of the Open Service Access (OSA).

13. In a related art of communication networks, Bos disclosed a system for implementing a plurality of applications and capabilities for a terminal. Similar to the invention of Deo, Bos disclosed providing applications to a communication terminal in response to signals transmitted through the network (see column 4, lines 34-65). Most interesting is the disclosed use of OSA for connecting applications to service capabilities (see column 5, lines 19-53).

14. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Deo and Bos to provide a system for sending triggers to a service node in

Art Unit: 2144

response to call events received at a call server, and determining and executing applications in response to the triggers through an API, where the API comprised OSA. The use of OSA for interfacing applications to communication services was well known at the time of invention as suggested by Bos (see column 5, lines 19-53). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to consider the use of the OSA architecture in the invention of Deo as Bos disclosed it to help applications become independent from the underlying network technology and help to hide the network complexity from applications (see column 5, lines 31-35, 38-41), a problem that Deo similarly recognized and sought to overcome (see column 1, lines 40-61; column 5, lines 38-46).

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments filed 04/14/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

16. Regarding claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, Examiner accepts Applicant's amendment to the claims in overcoming the rejection. The rejection has been withdrawn.

17. Regarding claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-11, 14, 15, 17, 19-22, 32-34, and 37 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Deo et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,393,481), hereinafter referred to as Deo, Applicant asserts that the reference does not teach or suggest "to perform a service interaction management analysis to determine if at least one application should be executed upon reception of a first and second triggers".

Art Unit: 2144

Examiner submits that Deo reads upon the broad concept, as it was disclosed that upon reception of call triggers, a Feature Discriminator logic determined which service to perform on a call based on some available criteria (see column 18, line 44). This clearly demonstrates the same functionality claimed where in response to a call trigger, a logic determination is made on which service application should execute.

18. Regarding claims 4, 7, 12, 13, 18, 23, 24, 35, and 36 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deo et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,393,481) further in view of Bos et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,456,857), Applicant further asserts that neither reference teaches or suggests "to perform a service interaction management analysis to determine if at least one application should be executed upon reception of a first and second triggers". In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Additionally, as recited above, Deo reads upon the broad concept as claimed.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph R. Maniwang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3928. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MARC D. THOMPSON
MARC THOMPSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER